



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/158,308	09/22/98	WEIRATHER	310048-401

IM62/1107
OPPENHEIMER WOLFF AND DONNELLY
2029 CENTURY PARK EAST
SUITE 3800
LOS ANGELES CA 90067

EXAMINER

GRAY, L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1734

15

DATE MAILED: 11/07/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/158,308

Applicant(s)
Weirather et al.

Examiner
Linda L. Gray

Group Art Unit
1734



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8-21-00

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 142-231 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☒ Claim(s) 143, 182, 196, 197, 213, 218, 222, and 227 is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 142, 144-149, 160-164, 167-173, 176-180, 195, 201, 202, and 204-207 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 150-159, 165, 166, 174, 175, 181, 183-194, 198-200, 203, and 208-214 are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 13

☒ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The indicated allowability of the subject matter of canceled claims 88 and 92, now presented in claims 142 and 144, is withdrawn in view of Klein (US 5,198,275). A rejection based on Klein follows. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. **Claims 145-149, 160-163, 169, 195, 201-202, and 212 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Klein.**

Claims 145, 201, and 195, Klein teaches providing individual laminate cardstock including liner sheet 90 including a sheet and ultraremovable adhesive 95 on the sheet and cardstock sheet 80 adhered to adhesive 95, cutting through sheet 80 to sheet 90 to form cardstock cut lines 200 defining at least in part perimeters of printable media, and cutting through an outer face of sheet 90 to sheet 80 to form liner-sheet cut lines 300 defining a plurality of liner strips on the back of the laminate cardstock. As shown in Figure 8, the cardstock is provided as a plurality of connected cardstocks fan folded. Klein teaches that the cardstock can be individual sheets or a continuous cardstock which is fanfolded at intervals of the sheets. The individual sheets or continuous cardstock are printed upon using automated equipment after cutting, and the individual sheets can be provided from the continuous cardstock. Klein teaches adhesive-receptive coating 125 on the sheet in contact with adhesive 95 (c 2, L 40, to c 4, L 15).

Claim 146, each sheet includes more than one liner strip. **Claims 147 and 202**, the media are arranged on the sheet in a matrix form including a plurality of columns and rows. **Claims 148-149**, the media are rectangular business cards. **Claim 160**, the construction is feed through a printer for a printing operation on sheet 80 to print on the media to form printed media. **Claim 161**, after printing the media can be removed from the strips for use. **Claim 162**, the media can be removed from the strips by peeling. **Claim 163**, the media include individual, printed, and clean edged business cards. **Claim 169**, lines 200 define the entire media perimeter.

3. **Claims 142 and 164 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein in view of Carlson (US 5,842,722).**

Claims 142 and 164, the above discussion of Klein applies herein.

Claims 142 and 164, *Klein is silent on how the individual sheets are feed to the printer in that Klein does not teach automatically individually feeding the individual sheets in a stack from an automatic feed tray to the printer.*

It is conventional to print information on individual sheets by automatically individually feeding the

sheets in a stack from an automatic feed tray to the printer because such allows one to print on a large number of sheets very quickly. Carlson demonstrates such at column 6, line 64, to column 7, line 34.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Klein automatically individually feeding the individual sheets in a stack from an automatic feed tray to the printer because it is conventional to print information on individual sheets by automatically individually feeding the sheets in a stack from an automatic feed tray to the printer because such allows one to print on a large number of sheets very quickly and demonstrated by Carlson.

4. Claims 144, 167-168, 170-173, 176-178, 179-180, and 204-207 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein.

The above discussion of Klein applies.

Claims 144 and 168, although Klein indicates that the individual sheets can be provided from the continuous cardstock, Klein does not teach providing such by cutting.

It is conventional to cut individual sheets from continuous cardstock by cutting because cutting provides an efficient and clean method of providing the individual sheets, and for this reason it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Klein that the providing of the individual sheets from the continuous cardstocks is by cutting.

Claim 167, Klein does not indicate which cut lines are made first in that Klein does not teach cutting lines 300 after cutting lines 200.

However, MPEP § 2144.04 ("Changes in Sequence of Adding Ingredients") indicates that a particular order (i.e., cutting sequence) is prima facie obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results

Claims 170-171, 180, and 204-205, Klein does not teach specifics about the cutting of lines 200 and 300 in that Klein does not teach that cutting lines 200 and 300 is by die or laser cutting.

Die and laser cutting are conventional in the art, and for this reason it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Klein that cutting lines 200 and 300 is by die or laser cutting because such are conventional in the art and it is obvious to replace one type of cutting with another art recognized type of cutting.

Claims 172 and 206, Klein does not teach film 125 to be extrusion low density polyethylene and sheet 90 to be densified bleached kraft.

Films of extrusion coated low density polyethylene are known because such are non-adhesive. Liners of densified bleached kraft are known because such are durable, and for this reason it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Klein that film 125 is and extrusion coated low density polyethylene and sheet 90 is densified kraft.

Claims 173 and 207, Klein does not teach adhesive 95 to be hot melt adhesive.

Hot melt adhesives are known because such are easy to apply, and for this reason it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Klein that adhesive 95 is hot melt adhesive.

Claims 176-178, Klein does not teach calendering for cutting.

It is known to calender an endless web to keep tension within the web, and for this reason it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Klein calendering the continuous cardstock for cutting because it is known to calender an endless web to keep tension within the web.

Claim 179, Klein does not teach printing before cutting.

However, MPEP § 2144.04 ("Changes in Sequence of Adding Ingredients") indicates that a particular order (i.e., printing before cutting) is prima facie obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 143 and 196 are allowed.

Claims 150 and 156 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The subject matters of claims 151 and 154-155 are also allowable to the extent that such depend from claim 150. The subject matters of claims 152-153 are also allowable to the extent that such depend from claim 151. The subject matters of claims 157-159 are allowable to the extent that such depend from claim 156.

Claims 165-166 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 174 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The subject matter of claim 175 is also allowable to the extent that such depends from claim 174.

Claim 181 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 182 is allowed. The subject matters of claims 183-194 are also allowable to the extent that such depend directly or indirectly from claim 182.

Claim 197 is allowed. The subject matters of claims 198-200 are also allowable to the extent that such depend directly from claim 197.

Claim 203 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 208 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The subject matters of claims 209-211 is also allowable to the extent that such depend directly or indirectly from claim 208.

Claim 213 is allowed. The subject matters of claims 214-217 are also allowable to the extent that such depend directly or indirectly from claim 213.

Claim 218 is allowed. The subject matters of claim 219-221 are also allowable to the extent that such depend directly from claim 218.

Claim 222 is allowed. The subject matters of claim 223-226 are also allowable to the extent that such depend directly from claim 222.

Claim 227 is allowed. The subject matters of claim 228-231 are also allowable to the extent that such depend directly from claim 227.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: while the prior art of record teaches the limitations of claim 145, the prior art of record does not teach the following:


claims 150 and 208, removing an end strip of the cardstock to expose a top surface of a strip of an end one of the liner strips where the exposed strip defines a printer infeed end of the construction; **claims 156 and 197**, removing some of the liner strips from the cardstock before feeding the cardstock into a printer or copier for printing information thereon; **claim 166**, that lines 300 are a wavy curved shape; **claim 174**, that the cardstock is provided in a roll and that before cutting the roll is loaded onto a press with sheet 90 up; **claim 181**, that the liner strips are oppositely-facing, spaced fish-shaped strips; **claims 182 and 196**, removing some of the liner strips as a complete web from the cardstock; **claim 203**, that the cards directly abut cards in adjacent row and columns separated only by lines 200; **claims 213 and 218**, forming a liner strip along a leading edge of sheet 80 and removing this strip after cutting; and **claims 222 and 227**, forming a liner-sheet flexibility line in sheet 90 which forms a liner sheet strip along a leading edge of sheet 90.

As allowable subject matter has been indicated, Applicants' reply must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with, 37 CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).

Conclusion

6. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 142 and 144 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. The newly added claims have been considered. The amendment to add claim 197 (see canceled claim 80) overcomes the Fagnant et al. reference.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Examiner Linda L. Gray at (703)308-1093, Monday-Friday from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm. The necessary fax numbers are (703)305-7718 (official), (703)305-7115 (unofficial), and (703)305-3599 (after final).

llg 
November 2, 2000


Primary Examiner